



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Colin
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/036,922	12/21/2001	Dana B. Fecher	10541-14	5046
29074	7590	02/16/2006		EXAMINER
VISTEON				LEVITAN, DMITRY
C/O BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
PO BOX 10395				2662
CHICAGO, IL 60610				

DATE MAILED: 02/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/036,922	FECHER ET AL.
	Examiner Dmitry Levitan	Art Unit 2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 January 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 3 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Amendment, filed 1/13/06, has been entered. Claims 1-30 remain pending.

Drawings

1. The drawings were received on 1/13/06. These drawings are approved.
2. In light of the Applicant amendment, the objections to the drawings have been withdrawn.

Specification

In light of the Applicant amendment, the objections to the disclosure have been withdrawn.

Claim Objections

In light of the Applicant amendment, the objection to the claim 28 has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

In light of the Applicant amendment, the rejections under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 9, 13-15, 25 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mikiya in view of Kennedy (US 6,167,255).
2. Regarding claims 1, 4, 9, 13, 25 and 27-29, Mikiya substantially teaches the limitations of claims 1, 9, 13 and 27-29:

An in-vehicle data system (car emergency system on Fig. 1-3 and [0004]) comprising:

A vehicle telecommunication device for two-way voice and data communication between the vehicle and a remote telecommunication device (two-way radio 2 on Fig. 1-3 operating as a cellular phone on Fig. 1 and with an external computer 9 on Fig. 2 [0004]);

An external computer (external computer 9 on Fig. 2 and [0020]);

A host processor (CPU 7, receiving the alarm signal, and selection circuitry 4 on Fig. 2, producing a control signal for switch 5 as shown on Fig. 2 and [0020] and [0021])
including:

A second communication port having an input coupled with the vehicle communication device and an output (by-directional modem 6, connected with radio 2 through switch 5 on Fig. 2), and

A first communication port having an input coupled with the external computer and an output (by-directional connection between external computer 9 and switch 5 on Fig. 2); and

A switch circuit (switch 5 on Fig. 2) responsible to a control signal from the host processor (control signal from selection circuitry 10 on Fig. 2 and [0015]) for coupling the external computer to one of the output of the first communication port and the input of the second communication port (connecting the external computer 9 to the radio 2 in one position of switch 5 shown on Fig. 2 for the computer data communication) and for coupling the vehicle telecommunication device to one of the output of the second communication port and the external computer (connecting radio 2 to modem 6 through the other position of switch 5 for emergency communication).

Mikiya does not teach external computer connected to the system through a connector and external computer providing a ready control signal.

Kennedy teaches external computer connected to the system through a connector (laptop computer 30 on Fig. 1, connected with the host computer/system 12 through bus 32, inherently comprising a connector, because computer 38 is a laptop and connection of the host system with a laptop require a connector 7:54-8:10) and external computer providing a ready control signal/predetermined code (external computer is integrated into the host computer/system 12, inherently producing a ready control signal/predetermined code, because ready control signal is essential for the computers integration into a LAN as disclosed on 8:5-10 to exchange information with the other elements of the LAN 7:57-62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add external computer connected to the system through a connector and external computer providing a ready control signal of Kennedy to the system of Mikiya to make the system flexible by adding a connector for a detachable external computer/laptop and integrating the laptop into the system.

In addition, regarding claim 25, producing a control signal in response to the ready control signal is inherent in the system of Mikiya in view of Kennedy, because the control signal is essential for the system to connect an external computer through switch 5, in the system of Mikiya, after the external computer is integrated into the host system per the integration process of Kennedy, producing a ready control signal.

In addition, regarding claims 28 and 29, Mikiya teaches automatic connection of the external computer to the radio [0004] and the integration process of Kennedy inherently requires

Art Unit: 2616

monitoring the data transmitted from the laptop to the host computer, because any protocol for computer integration will require monitoring the data/commands of the other computer at the integration stage).

3. Regarding claims 6, 7, 14 and 15, Mikiya teaches telecommunication device as a radio telephone and a cellular phone (Abstract and [0018]).

4. Claims 2, 8, 16-20, 26, 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mikiya in view of Kennedy.

5. Regarding claims 8, 16 and 30 Mikiya in view of Kennedy teach all the limitations of the parent's claims (see rejection of claims 1, 6, 9 and 14 above).

6. Regarding claims 8 and 16 Mikiya does not teach using satellite phone as the vehicle telecommunication device.

Kennedy teaches using satellite phone fro communication between a mobile unit 12, as shown on Fig. 1, and network switching center 14 8:12-20.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use satellite phone of Kennedy in the system of Mikiya to extend the range of the system use to the areas not covered by cellular telephone communications.

7. Regarding claim 30, Mikiya in view of Kennedy does not teach mounting the connector at a dash of the vehicle.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to mount the connector at a dash of the vehicle in the system of Mikiya in view of Kennedy,

because a dash in the vehicle is an obvious choice for the location of the connector as it close and convenient location for the driver.

8. Regarding claims 2, 17-20 and 26, Mikiya in view of Kennedy substantially teaches the limitations of claims 17 and 25: (see claim 1 rejection above), including in response to a ready control signal coupling the external computer to the radio (inherently part of the system, because when the external computer is integrated into the system it is automatically connected to two-way radio data communication [0004]) and in response to a predetermined event disconnect the external computer from the radio and connect the radio to the host system [0020].

Mikiya in view of Kennedy does not teach coupling the host to the radio in absence of the ready control signal.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add coupling the host to the radio in absence of the ready control signal to the system of Mikiya in view of Kennedy, because the absence of the ready control signal from the external computer indicates that the computer is not ready for the data communication, therefore connecting the radio to the host prepares the system for an emergency communication, making the delay between the emergency event and the radio request for help shorter.

9. Regarding claim 21, Mikiya in view of Kennedy substantially teaches the limitations of claim 17 (see claim 17 rejection above).

Mikiya in view of Kennedy (portion of the teachings relied on in the rejections above) does not teach determining a priority among events in the vehicle, detecting an event and if the external computer is engaged in two way communication, comparing priority of the detected

event with the priority for the two-way communication, and interrupting the two-way communication according to the priority comparison.

Kennedy teaches determining a priority among events in the vehicle (identifying service from a service center 4:24-28 as non-critical application and assigning it standard priority 11:12-16 in comparison with critical emergency application 11:19-29), detecting an event (car crash 11:19-23) and if the external computer is engaged in two way communication (non-emergency communication with service center 16), comparing priority of the detected event with the priority for the two-way communication (identifying car crash as critical application in comparison with non-critical communication with service center), and interrupting the two-way communication according to the priority comparison (upgrading the priority of service message 58 with the emergency information 11:19-29).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add determining a priority among events in the vehicle, detecting an even and if the external computer is engaged in two way communication, comparing priority of the detected event with the priority for the two-way communication, and interrupting the two-way communication according to the priority comparison to the system of Mikiya in view of Kennedy to increase safety of the vehicle, by giving priority to safety related applications.

10. Claims 5, 10-12 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mikiya in view of Kennedy in further view of EIA/TIA 232 standard.

Mikiya in view of Kennedy teach first and second communication circuits/ports coupling the host with the switch and external computer or telecommunication device (shown on Fig. 2 and in rejections of claims 1 and 17 above).

Mikiya in view of Kennedy does not teach first and second communication circuits as serial communication circuits and utilizing the standard commands on them.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use serial communication circuits of 232 standard, including the standard commands, in the system of Mikiya in view of Kennedy, to make the system compatible with numerous computers using serial 232 circuits for an external connection.

Allowable Subject Matter

11. Claim 3 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 4-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dmitry Levitan whose telephone number is (571) 272-3093. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 to 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chi Pham can be reached on (571) 272-3179. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Dmitry Levitan
Patent Examiner.
02/13/06